



APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Revised 7/93

CBO16

IMPORTANT: Applicant should consult the "Instructions for Completion of Project Application" for assistance in the proper completion of this form.

SUBDIVISION: CITY OF CINCINNATI CODE# 061- 15000

DISTRICT NUMBER: 2 COUNTY: HAMILTON DATE 9 / 15 / 95

CONTACT: DOUG PERRY PHONE #(513) 352-3407

(THE PROJECT CONTACT PERSON SHOULD BE THE INDIVIDUAL WHO WILL BE AVAILABLE ON A DAY-TO-DAY BASIS DURING THE APPLICATION REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS AND WHO CAN BEST ANSWER OR COORDINATE THE RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS)

PROJECT NAME: READING ROAD REHABILITATION

SUBDIVISION TYPE

(Check Only 1)

- ☐ 1. County  
☒ 2. City  
☐ 3. Township  
☐ 4. Village  
☐ 5. Water/Sanitary District  
(Section 6119 O.R.C.)

FUNDING TYPE REQUESTED

(Check All Requested & Enter Amount)

- ☒ 1. Grant \$ 637,000  
☐ 2. Loan \$  
☐ 3. Loan Assistance \$  
MBE SET-ASIDE OFFERED  
Construction \$  
Procurement \$

PROJECT TYPE

(Check Largest Component)

- ☒ 1. Road  
☐ 2. Bridge/Culvert  
☐ 3. Water Supply  
☐ 4. Wastewater  
☐ 5. Solid Waste  
☐ 6. Stormwater

TOTAL PROJECT COST:\$ 910,000

FUNDING REQUESTED:\$ 637,000

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION

To be completed by the District Committee ONLY

GRANT: \$ 637,000.00  
LOAN: \$

LOAN ASSISTANCE: \$  
% TERM: yrs. (Attach Loan Supplement)

(Check Only 1)

- ☒ State Capital Improvement Program  
☐ Local Transportation Improvements Program  
☐ Small Government Program

DISTRICT MBE SET-ASIDE

Construction \$  
Procurement \$

FOR OPWC USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: C /C  
Local Participation %  
OPWC Participation %  
Project Release Date: / /  
OPWC Approval:

APPROVED FUNDING:\$  
Loan Interest Rate:  
Loan Term: years  
Maturity Date:  
Date Approved: / /

## 1.0 PROJECT FINANCIAL INFORMATION

### 1.1 PROJECT ESTIMATED COSTS:

(Round to Nearest Dollar)

- a.) Project Engineering Costs:
1. Preliminary Engineering \$ .00
  2. Final Design \$ .00
  3. Other Engineer Services \* \$ .00
  - Supervision \$ .00
  - Miscellaneous \$ .00
- b.) Acquisition Expenses:
1. Land \$ .00
  2. Right-of-Way \$ .00
- c.) Construction Costs: \$ 910,000.00
- d.) Equipment Purchased Directly: \$ .00
- e.) Other Direct Expenses: \$ .00
- f.) Contingencies: \$ .00
- g.) TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS: \$ 910,000.00

MBE	Force Account
\$	\$
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

### 1.2 PROJECT FINANCIAL RESOURCES:

(Round to Nearest Dollar and Percent)

- a.) Local In-Kind Contributions \$ .00
- b.) Local Public Revenues \$ 273,000.00
- c.) Local Private Revenues \$ .00
- d.) Other Public Revenues
1. ODOT PID# \$ .00
  2. EPA/OWDA \$ .00
  3. OTHER \$ .00

SUB TOTAL LOCAL RESOURCES: \$ 273,000.00 30%

- e.) OPWC Funds
1. Grant \$ 637,000.00
  2. Loan \$ .00
  3. Loan Assistance \$ .00

SUB TOTAL OPWC RESOURCES: \$ 637,000.00 70%

f.) TOTAL FINANCIAL RESOURCES: \$ 910,000.00 100%

\*Other Engineer's Services must be outlined in detail on the required certified engineer's estimate.

### 1.3 AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL FUNDS:

Attach a summary from the Chief Financial Officer listed in section 5.2 listing all local share funds budgeted for the project and the date they are anticipated to be available.

## **2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION**

**IMPORTANT:** If project is multi-jurisdictional, information must be consolidated in this section.

**2.1 PROJECT NAME:** Reading Road Rehabilitation

**2.2 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION - (Sections a through d):**

**a: SPECIFIC LOCATION:**

Reading Road from Wm. H. Taft Road to Paddock Road  
(see attached map)

**PROJECT ZIP CODE:** 45206 & 45229

**b: PROJECT COMPONENTS:**

Rehabilitation of existing roadway including repair and replacement of curb, base and joint repairs, removal of existing asphalt surface, inlet and connection pipe repairs, casting adjustments and resurfacing with a minimum of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete.

**c: PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS / CHARACTERISTICS:**

Roadway is 4 lanes, 44 feet in width and 13,700 feet in length.

**d: DESIGN SERVICE CAPACITY:**

**IMPORTANT:** Detail shall be included regarding current service capacity vs proposed service level. If road or bridge project, include ADT. If water or wastewater project, include both current residential rates based on monthly usage of 7,756 gallon per household.

Attach current rate ordinance.

ADT = 24,200

No change in service capacity

Will use standard rehabilitation practices to upgrade the roadway to excellent condition.

**2.3 USEFUL LIFE / COST ESTIMATE:** Project Useful Life: 20 Years.

Attach Registered Professional Engineer's statement, with original seal and signature certifying the project's useful life indicated above and estimated cost.

### 3.0 REPAIR/REPLACEMENT or NEW/EXPANSION:

TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT REPAIR/REPLACEMENT      \$ 910,000      100%  
State Funds Requested for Repair and Replacement      \$ 637,000      70%

TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT NEW/EXPANSION      \$ \_\_\_\_\_ %  
State Funds Requested for New and Expansion      \$ \_\_\_\_\_ %

### 4.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE:\*

	BEGIN DATE	END DATE
4.1 Engineering/Design:	<u>1/ 1/ 96</u>	<u>6/ 1/ 96</u>
4.2 Bid Advertisement:	<u>6/ 1/ 96</u>	<u>9/ 1/ 96</u>
4.3 Construction:	<u>9/ 1/ 96</u>	<u>12/ 31/ 97</u>

\* Failure to meet project schedule may result in termination of agreement for approved projects. Modification of dates must be approved in writing by the Commission once the Project Agreement has been executed. Dates should assume project agreement approval/release on July 1st. of the Program Year applied for.

### 5.0 APPLICANT INFORMATION:

#### 5.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE

OFFICER John F. Shirey  
TITLE City Manager  
STREET Room 152, City Hall  
801 Plum Street  
CITY/ZIP Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
PHONE (513 )352 - 3241  
FAX ( ) -

#### 5.2 CHIEF FINANCIAL

OFFICER Frank A. Dawson  
TITLE Finance Director  
STREET Room 250, City Hall  
801 Plum Street  
CITY/ZIP Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
PHONE (513 )352 - 3731  
FAX ( ) -

#### 5.3 PROJECT MANAGER

TITLE Jay Gala  
STREET Principal Construction Engineer  
Room 415, City Hall  
801 Plum Street  
CITY/ZIP Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
PHONE (513 )352 - 3423  
FAX (513 )352 - 1581

## 6.0 ATTACHMENTS/COMPLETENESS REVIEW:

Check each section below, confirming that all required information is included in this application.

X A certified copy of the legislation by the governing body of the applicant authorizing a designated official to submit this application and execute contracts. (Attach)

X A summary from the applicant's Chief Financial Officer listing all local share funds budgeted for the project and the date they are anticipated to be available. (Attach)

X A registered professional engineer's estimate of projects useful life and cost estimate, as required in 164-1-14 and 164-1-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimates shall contain engineer's original seal and signature. (Attach)

\_\_\_ A copy of the cooperation agreement(s) if this project involves more than one subdivision or district. (Attach)

X Capital Improvements Report: (Required by 164 O.R.C. on standard form)

\_\_\_ A: Attached.

X B: Report/Update Filed with the Commission within the last twelve months.

N/A Floodplain Management Permit: Required if project is in 100 year floodplain. See Instructions.

X Supporting Documentation: Materials such as additional project description, photographs, economic impact (temporary and/or full time jobs likely to be created as a result of the project), and other information to assist your district committee in ranking your project.

## 7.0 APPLICANT CERTIFICATION:

The undersigned certifies that: (1) he/she is legally authorized to request and accept financial assistance from the Ohio Public Works Commission; (2) that to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, all representations that are part of this application are true and correct; (3) that all official documents and commitments of the applicant that are part of this application have been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant; and, (4) should the requested financial assistance be provided, that in the execution of this project, the applicant will comply with all assurances required by Ohio Law, including those involving minority business utilization, Buy Ohio, and prevailing wages.

**IMPORTANT:** Applicant certifies that physical construction on the project as defined in the application has NOT begun, and will not begin until a Project Agreement on this project has been executed with the Ohio Public Works Commission. Action to the contrary will result in termination of the agreement and withdrawal of Ohio Public Works Commission funding of the project.

John F. Shirey, City Manager

Certifying Representative (Type or Print Name and Title)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature/Date Signed

# City of Cincinnati



Department of Public Works  
Division of Engineering

Room 440, City Hall  
801 Plum Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

John Hamner  
*Director*

Prem Garg, P.E.  
*City Engineer*


September 15, 1995

Subject: Reading Road Rehabilitation  
William H. Taft Road to Paddock Road  
Certification of Useful Life for OPWC Projects

As required by Chapter 164-1-13 of the Ohio Administrative Code,  
I hereby certify that the design useful life of the subject  
street improvement is at least twenty (20) years.




(seal)

  
Prem Garg, P.E.  
City Engineer  
City of Cincinnati

1996 STREET REHABILITATION, SCIP  
Reading Road

REF. NO.	ITEM NO.	ESTIMATED QUANTITIES	DESCRIPTION	EST. UNIT PRICE	ESTIMATED COST
1	103.05	Lump Sum	Contract Bond		\$10,855.00
2	Special	1,400 s.y.	Part Depth Pavt. Rep(Conc. Pavt.)	\$27.00	\$37,800.00
3	Special	10 c.y.	Maintenance Patching	\$80.00	\$800.00
4	Special	100 l.f.	Connection Pipe Cleaned	\$10.00	\$1,000.00
5	Special	67,000 s.y.	SAMI, Type I	\$1.75	\$117,250.00
6	202	3,000 s.y.	Rigid Pavt. Removed-Full Depth	\$25.00	\$75,000.00
7	202	67,000 s.y.	Wearing Course Removed	\$1.50	\$100,500.00
8	301	400 c.y.	Bituminous Aggregate Base	\$80.00	\$32,000.00
9	305	1,500 s.y.	9" Concrete Base	\$35.00	\$52,500.00
10	403	2,000 c.y.	Asphalt Concrete Leveling Course	\$62.00	\$124,000.00
11	404	2,000 c.y.	Asphalt Concrete Surface Course	\$62.00	\$124,000.00
12	603	50 l.f.	12" Conduit, Type "H"	\$30.00	\$1,500.00
13	604	55 ea.	Manhole Adjust to Grade W/O Ring	\$175.00	\$9,625.00
14	604	20 ea.	Valve Chambers Adjust W/O Ring	\$175.00	\$3,500.00
15	604	4 ea.	SGL Adjusted To Grade	\$220.00	\$880.00
16	604	5 ea.	SGL Repaired & Adjusted To Grade	\$240.00	\$1,200.00
17	604	42 ea.	DGI Adjusted To Grade	\$230.00	\$9,660.00
18	604	55 ea.	DGI Repaired & Adjusted To Grade	\$260.00	\$14,300.00
19	608	5,480 s.f.	Handicap Ramp	\$4.00	\$21,920.00
20	608	3,000 s.f.	Concrete Walk	\$4.00	\$12,000.00
21	609	8,000 l.f.	Concrete Curb Repair, Type P-4	\$16.00	\$128,000.00
22	609	1,000 l.f.	Concrete Curb ,Type L-1	\$10.00	\$10,000.00
23	627	2,500 s.f.	Concrete Driveway	\$5.00	\$12,500.00
24	660	2,500 l.f.	Sod Restoration	\$2.00	\$5,000.00
25	1125	11 ea.	Reset Ex. Valve Box W/O Adjusters	\$110.00	\$1,210.00
26	619	Lump Sum	Field Office		\$3,000.00
				Total Cost	\$910,000.00

  
Prem Garg, P.E.  
City Engineer  
City of Cincinnati

# City of Cincinnati



Department of Finance

Room 250, City Hall  
801 Plum Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

F. A. Dawson  
*Director*

J. L. Andreyko  
*Deputy Director*

September 15, 1995

Mr. Laurence Bicking, Director  
Ohio Public Works Commission  
65 East State Street  
Suite 312  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Subject: Status of Funds for Local Share of 1996  
SCIP/LTIP Project Grants

Dear Mr. Bicking:

The local matching share for the following 1996 SCIP/LTIP Projects (Round 10 Funding) is recommended by the City Manager for funding in the City's 1996 Capital Improvement Program -

## STREET REHABILITATIONS

- \* William Howard Taft - Woodburn to Vine
- \* Vine Street - Paddock to North Corp. Line
- \* Eastern Avenue - Kellogg to Bains
- \* Spring Grove Avenue - Mitchell to North Corp. Line
- \* Reading Road - Dorchester to Paddock
- \* Ludlow Avenue - Cornell to Central Parkway
- \* Glenway Avenue - Boudinot to Werk
- \* Kellogg Avenue - Salem to I-275
- \* North Bend Road - Colerain to West North Corp. Line
- \* Madison Road - Brotherton to Observatory
- \* Boudinot Avenue - Glenway to North Corp. Line

## STREET IMPROVEMENTS & WIDENINGS

- \* Southside Avenue Improvement - Phase II
- \* Brighton Intersection Improvement
- \* Colerain Avenue Improvement - Leeper to North Bend  
(Stage 2 funding, pre-approved in Round 9)
- \* Crookshank Road Improvement (jointly w/HamCo Eng.)



September 15, 1995  
Mr. Laurence Bicking  
Page -2-


BRIDGE/STRUCTURE PROJECTS

- \* Dremman Avenue over West Branch of Millcreek
- \* Columbia Parkway - Wall "D" Rehabilitation
- \* Settle Avenue Bridge over Little Duck Creek
- \* Salem Avenue Ramp over Kellogg Avenue

The matching funds for these projects are coming from Street Improvement Bonds which are scheduled for sale in the early part of 1996.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (513) 352-3731.

Sincerely,



F. A. Dawson  
Director of Finance

City of Cincinnati

657  
J.S.G.

An Ordinance No. 421 1993

AUTORIZING the City Manager to apply for and accept street rehabilitation, street improvement, bridge rehabilitation and bridge replacement project funding grants from the State of Ohio, Ohio Public Works Commission, in the approximate amount of \$9,163,000, and to execute any agreements necessary for the receipt and administration of said grants.

WHEREAS, the State Capital Improvement Program and Local Transportation Improvement Program provide for infrastructure funding; and

WHEREAS, the District 2 Integrating Committee is accepting applications for projects within Hamilton County, the State of Ohio; and

WHEREAS, the City of Cincinnati has the required \$4,199,000 in matching funds for 1994, for fifteen (15) street rehabilitation projects; namely Anderson Ferry Road, Crawford Road, Dalton Street, Daly Road, West Eighth Street, Elberon Avenue, Freeman Avenue, Gast Street, Linn Street, Madison Road, Mehring Way, Pete Rose Way, Plainville Road and Reading Road; and five (5) street improvement projects; namely North Crescent Avenue, North Bend Road, Vine Street at Forest/Woolper Intersection, Woodford Road and Werk Road; and two (2) bridge replacement projects; namely Dremar Avenue over West Fork Channel and North Bend Road over Millcreek; and one (1) bridge rehabilitation project; namely Beekman Street over Millcreek; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Cincinnati, State of Ohio:

Section 1. That the City Manager is hereby authorized to execute and file applications, on behalf of the City of Cincinnati, with the Ohio Public Works Commission through the Hamilton County District 2 Integrating Committee, for grants, in the approximate amount of \$9,163,000 for funding fifteen (15) street rehabilitation


projects; namely Anderson Ferry Road, Crawford Road, Dalton Street, Daly Road, West Eighth Street, Elberon Avenue, Freeman Avenue, Gast Street, Linn Street, Madison Road, Mehring Way, Pete Rose Way, Plainville Road and Reading Road; and five (5) street improvement projects; namely North Crascent Avenue, North Bend Road, Vine Street at Forest/Woolper Intersection, Woodford Road and Werk Road; and two (2) bridge replacement projects; namely Dremar Avenue over West Fork Channel and North Bend Road over Millcreek; and one (1) bridge rehabilitation project; namely Beekman Street over Millcreek; and to accept such grants if awarded by the Ohio Public Works Commission.


Section 2. That the City Manger is heraby authorized to execute such agreements and other documents as are required by the State for receipt and administration of the above grants.

Section 3. This Ordinance shall take effect from and at the earliest period allowed by law.


Passed November 24 A.D., 1993

Attest:


  
Clerk

  
Mayor

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ORDINANCE NO. 421  
19 93 WAS PUBLISHED IN THE CITY BULLETIN  
IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CHARTER ON 12-7-93

  
Clerk of Council

Continued On Map No. 5



# READING ROAD (S)



# READING ROAD (S)



# City of Cincinnati



Department of Public Works  
Division of Traffic Engineering

705 Central Avenue, Suite 250  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
513-352-6229

## CERTIFICATION OF TRAFFIC COUNT

John H. Hamner  
*Director of Public Works*

Steven G. Bailey, P.E.  
*City Traffic Engineer*

As required by the District 2 Integrating Committee, I hereby certify that the traffic counts herein attached to the Reading Road Rehabilitation project application are a true and accurate count done by the City of Cincinnati's Traffic Engineering Division.

Stephen I. Niemeier, P.E.  
Supervising Engineer

# ADDITIONAL SUPPORT INFORMATION

For Program Year 1996 (July 1, 1996 through June 30, 1997), jurisdictions shall provide the following support information to help determine which projects will be funded. Information on this form must be accurate, and where called for, based on sound engineering principles. Documentation to substantiate the individual items may be required by the Support Staff if information does not appear to be accurate.

- 1) What is the condition of the existing infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded? For bridges, submit a copy of the current State form BR-86.

Closed \_\_\_\_\_ Poor X  
Fair \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_

Give a brief statement of the nature of the deficiency of the present facility such as: inadequate load capacity (bridge); surface type and width; number of lanes; structural condition; substandard design elements such as berm width, grades, curves, sight distances, drainage structures, or inadequate service capacity. If known, give the approximate age of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded.

The roadway has Pavement Condition Number of 63 (poor) and Dynaflect tests indicate a Base Condition Index of 65 (poor). Pavement shows signs of fatigue - random and longitudinal cracking, alligator cracking, rutting, stripping of asphalt, curb lane and bus stop failures and joint and pavement failures.

- 2) If State Issue 2 funds are awarded, how soon (in weeks or months) after receiving the Project Agreement from OPWC (tentatively set for July 1, 1995) would the project be under contract? The Support Staff will be reviewing status reports of previous projects to help judge the accuracy of a particular jurisdiction's anticipated project schedule.

2 months (Circle one)

Are preliminary plans or engineering completed? Yes No

Are detailed construction plans completed? Yes No

Are all right-of-way and easements acquired? Yes No N/A

\*Please answer the following if applicable:

No. of parcels needed for project: \_\_\_\_\_ Of these, how many are takes \_\_\_\_\_, temporary \_\_\_\_\_, permanent \_\_\_\_\_

Of a separate sheet, explain the status of the ROW acquisition process of this project for any parcels not yet acquired.

Are all utility coordinations completed? Yes No N/A

Give an estimate of time, in weeks or months, to complete any item above not yet completed. 9 months



3) How will the proposed project impact the general health, safety and welfare of the service area? (Typical examples may include the effects of the completed project on accident rates, emergency response time, fire protection, health hazards, user benefits, and commerce.) Please be specific and provide documentation if necessary to substantiate the data.

Will reduce road user costs, assist in maintaining current tax base  
and will provide satisfactory road network for motoring public.

4) What type of funds are to be utilized for the local share for this project?

Federal _____	ODOT _____	Local <u>  X  </u>
MRF _____	OWDA _____	CD _____
Other _____		

Note: If MRF funds are being used for the local share, the MRF application must have been filed by August 1, 1995 for this project with the Hamilton County Engineer's Office.

The minimum amount of matching funds for grant projects (local share) must be at least 10% of the TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST. What percentage of matching funds are being committed to this project?

  30   %

5) Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a complete or partial ban of the use or expansion of use for the involved infrastructure? (Typical examples include weight limits, truck restrictions, and moratoriums or limitations on issuance of building permits.) A copy of the legislation must be submitted with the application. THE BAN MUST HAVE AN ENGINEERING JUSTIFICATION TO BE VALID.

Complete Ban \_\_\_\_\_ Partial Ban \_\_\_\_\_ No Ban   X  

Will the ban be removed after the project is completed?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

- 6) What is the total number of existing users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project?

Users = 29,040

For roads and bridges, multiply current documented Average Daily Traffic by 1.20. For public transit, submit documentation substantiating the count. Where the facility currently has any restrictions or is partially closed, use documented traffic counts prior to the restriction. For storm sewers, sanitary sewers, water lines, and other related facilities, multiply the number of households in the service area by 4.

- 7) Has the jurisdiction developed a Five Year Capital Improvement Plan as required in O.R.C., chapter 164? (This must be included with the application to be considered for funding.)

Yes   X   No       

- 8) Give a brief statement concerning the regional significance of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded.

This street is part of Federal Aid Primary System and is  
classified as a major arterial. Street is major artery through  
central part of City, running from downtown to northern portion  
of county. Provides access to university and hospital area as  
well as connecting surrounding residential areas to commercial  
points on Reading.

- 9) For expansion projects, please provide the existing and proposed Level of Service (LOS) of the facility using the methodology outlined within AASHTO's "Geometric Design of Highways and Streets" and the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual.

Existing LOS                      Proposed LOS                     

If the proposed LOS is not "C" or better, explain why LOS "C" cannot be achieved. (Attach separate sheets if necessary.)

---

---

---

---

STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM  
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

ROUND NO. 10

PROGRAM YEAR 1996 PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA - JULY 1, 1996 TO JUNE 30, 1997

ADOPTED BY THE DISTRICT 2 INTEGRATING COMMITTEE

JUNE 9, 1995

JURISDICTION/AGENCY: Cinti

NAME OF PROJECT: Leading Rehab

TOTAL POINTS FOR THIS PROJECT: 48 RATING TEAM NO. 2

NO. OF  
POINTS

10  
Rehab

- 1) If SCIP Funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded? (The Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience.)

10 Points - Will be under contract by December 31, 1996

5 Points - Will be under contract by March 30, 1997

0 Points - Will not be under contract by March 30, 1997

12  
BASED ON  
AVERAGE, THOUGH  
SHOWING IT  
QUITTING @  
BASE STOPS  
IS SEVERE  
IN SPOTS

- 2) What is the condition of the infrastructure to be replaced or repaired? For bridges, base condition on latest general appraisal and condition rating.

20 Points - Poor Condition

16 Points -

12 Points - Fair to Poor Condition

8 Points -

4 Points - Fair Condition

0 Points - Good or Better Condition

NOTE: If the infrastructure is in "good or better" condition it will NOT be considered for SCIP funding. If it is an expansion type project, and rated 0, it will be considered for LTIP only.

1 3) If the project is built, what will be its effect on the facility's serviceability?

Rehab

- 5 Points - Significant effect (e.g., widen to and add lanes along entire project)
- 4 Points - Moderate to significant effect
- 3 Points - Moderate effect (e.g., widen existing lanes)
- 2 Points - Moderate to little effect
- 1 Point - Little or no effect (e.g., street or bridge deck rehabilitation)

4 4) How important is the project to the HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE of the public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

NOTICEABLE ON SAFETY, DUE TO SEVERE RUTTING AT BUS STOPS & INTERSECTIONS, IN AREAS, RUTS HAD CREATED HUMPS SO HIGH THAT ~~THEY HAVE~~ BEEN GROUND TO ROAD BOTTOMING OUT.

- 10 Points - Highly significant importance, with substantial impact on all 3 factors
- 8 Points - Considerably significant importance, with substantial impact on 2 factors OR noticeable impact on all 3 factors
- 6 Points - Moderate importance, with substantial impact on 1 factor or noticeable impact on 2 factors
- 4 Points - Minimal importance, with noticeable impact on 1 factor
- 2 Points - No measurable impact

6 5) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

- 10 Points - Poor
- 8 Points -
- 6 Points - Fair
- 4 Points -
- 2 Points - Excellent

3 6) What matching funds are being committed to the project, expressed as a percentage of the TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST? Loan and Credit Enhancement projects automatically receive 5 points, and no match is required. All grant funded projects require a minimum of 10% matching funds.

- 5 Points - 50% or more
- 4 Points - 40% to 49.99%
- 3 Points - 30% to 39.99%
- 2 Points - 20% to 29.99%
- 1 Point - 10% to 19.99%

0

7)

Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure? POINTS MAY ONLY BE AWARDED IF THE END RESULT OF THE PROJECT WILL CAUSE THE BAN TO BE LIFTED.

- 5 Points - Complete or significant ban
- 3 Points - Partial or moderate ban
- 0 Points - No ban of any kind

151

8)

See Wm H Taft

What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? Appropriate criteria include current certified traffic counts, or number of households served when converted to a measurement of persons. Public transit users are permitted to be counted for roads and bridges, but only when certified ridership figures are provided.

- 5 Points - 16,000 or more
- 4 Points - 12,000 to 15,999
- 3 Points - 8,000 to 11,999
- 2 Points - 4,000 to 7,999
- 1 Point - 0 to 3,999

.5

9)

Does the infrastructure have REGIONAL impact? Consider origins and destinations of traffic, functional classification, size of service area, number of jurisdictions served, etc.

- 5 Points - Major impact (e.g., major multi-jurisdictional route, primary feed route to an interstate, Federal Aid Primary routes)
- 4 Points -
- 3 Points - Moderate impact (e.g., principal thoroughfares, Federal-Aid Urban routes)
- 2 Points -
- 1 Point - Minimal or no impact (e.g., cul-de-sacs, subdivision streets)

2

10)

Has the jurisdiction enacted the optional \$5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or a dedicated tax for infrastructure?

- 2 Points - Two of the above
- 1 Point - One of the above
- 0 Points - None of the above

ADDENDUM TO THE RATING SYSTEM  
DEFINITIONS

CRITERION 1 - ABILITY TO PROCEED

The Support Staff will assign points based on:

- 1) Engineering experience
- 2) The information on the Additional Support Information, as verified where necessary.
- 3) The applicant's past SCIP/LTIP record of successfully projecting project schedules on similar types of projects.

If a project rating on this item is reduced by the Support Staff because of a questionable schedule, and still receives funding, the submitting jurisdiction will be permitted to amend the Project Schedule accordingly.

CRITERION 2 - CONDITION

Poor - Condition is dangerous, unsafe or unusable

Fair to Poor - Condition is inadequate or substandard

Fair - Condition is average, not good or poor

CRITERION 5 - ECONOMIC HEALTH

The following factors are used to determine economic health:

- 1) Median per capita income
- 2) Per capita assessed valuation of the total community real estate and personal property
- 3) Poverty indicators
- 4) Effective tax rates
- 5) Total corporate debt as a percentage of assessed valuation
- 6) Municipal revenues and expenditures per capita

CRITERION 9 - REGIONAL IMPACT

Major impact - Primary water or sewer main serving an entire system

Moderate impact - Waterline or storm sewer serving only part of a system

Minimal impact - Individual waterline or storm sewer not part of a system